

REMARKS

On February 5, 2007, an amendment and Request for Continued Examination was filed in response to Advisory Action of December 21, 2006. On April 12, 2007, the Office Action was mailed in which the amendments of February 5, 2007, were entered but none of the pending claims were allowed. Claims 1-13 and 17-50 are pending in the application. Independent claims 1, 17, 21, 28, 29, and 30 have been amended. Reconsideration of the present application in view of the amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §101

Independent claims 1, 17, 21, 28, 29, and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 for nonstatutory subject matter as not being limited to a substantial practical application. Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 17, 21, 28, 29 and 30 have been amended to recite a substantial practical application in accordance with 35 U.S.C. § 101 and are, therefore, in condition for allowance.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to recite “wherein the at least one aeroelastic analysis result may be used to determine whether the aeroelastic characteristics of the structure with the completed repair are acceptable.” As a result, independent claim 1 recites a substantial practical application in accordance with 35 U.S.C. § 101 and is allowable. Claims 2-13 and 31-35 which depend from allowable independent claim 1 are therefore also allowable.

Independent claim 17 has been amended to recite “determining whether the aeroelastic characteristics of the structure with the one or more completed repairs are acceptable.” As a result, independent claim 17 recites a substantial practical application in accordance with 35 U.S.C. § 101 and is allowable. Claims 18-20 and 36-41 which depend from allowable independent claim 17 are therefore also allowable.

Independent claim 21 has been amended to recite “wherein the aeroelastic analysis result may be used to determine whether the aircraft structure with the completed repair is acceptable for flight . . .” As a result, independent claim 21 recites a substantial practical application in accordance with 35 U.S.C. § 101 and is allowable. Claims 22-27 and 42-44 which depend from allowable independent claim 21 are therefore also allowable.

Independent claim 28 has been amended to recite “wherein the aeroelastic analysis result may be used to determine whether the aircraft structure with the completed repair is acceptable for flight . . .” As a result, independent claim 28 recites a substantial practical application in accordance with 35 U.S.C. § 101 and is allowable. Claims 45-48 which depend from allowable independent claim 28 are therefore also allowable.

Independent claim 29 has been amended to recite “wherein the aeroelastic analysis flutter result may be used to determine whether the aircraft structure with the completed repair is acceptable for flight . . .” As a result, independent claim 29 recites a substantial practical application in accordance with 35 U.S.C. § 101 and is allowable. Claims 49-51 which depend from allowable independent claim 29 are therefore also allowable.

Independent claim 30 has been amended to recite “wherein the aeroelastic analysis result may be used to determine whether the aircraft structure with the completed repair is acceptable for flight . . .” As a result, independent claim 30 recites a substantial practical application in accordance with 35 U.S.C. § 101 and is allowable. Claims 52-55 which depend from allowable independent claim 30 are therefore also allowable.

Conclusion

In view of the aforesaid, reconsideration and allowance of all claims at issue are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 9, 2007
Wildman, Harrold, Allen & Dixon LLP
225 West Wacker Drive
Chicago, IL 60606
Phone: (312) 201-2000
Fax: (312) 201-2555

By: /Louis DiSanto/
Gary R. Gillen
Reg. No. 35,157
Louis DiSanto
Reg. No. 51,331